UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

V.

VALENTINO JOHNSON,

Defendant.

them to abandon a specific defense strategy?

Case No. 14-cr-00412-TEH

ORDER RE: HEARING ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY

Counsel shall come prepared to address the following questions at the May 4, 2015 hearing on Defendant's motion to compel discovery:

For Prosecution

- 1. Is it the Government certain that the *Furminger* text messages do not include any officers involved in the 2011 homicide, 2014 burglary, or Defendant's arrest aside from former Officer Dougherty?
- 2. The Government's opposition focused on the argument that the Government has already disclosed all *Brady/Giglio* evidence contained in the personnel files. Given that Rule 16 is more expansive than *Brady/Giglio*, why do the personnel files not contain Rule 16 evidence that is not be covered by *Brady/Giglio*?

3. How does the Government respond to Defendant's argument that it should have access to the personnel files even if they contain no exculpatory evidence because this will allow

4. Is the Government willing to submit the personnel files for *in camera* review so that the Court can determine whether they contain any evidence material to the defense?

22

23

24

25

2627

28

United States District Court Northern District of California

	For Defendant
	1. Does Defendant have any reason to believe that one of the unidentified Furminger
	officers was also involved in the 2011 homicide, 2014 burglary, or Defendant's arrest?
	2. The Government has established that the personnel files do not contain any exculpatory
	or impeachment evidence. Defendant has articulated no reason to believe this is not true.
	By what authority should Defendant be allowed to verify the Government's claim?
	3. Defendant states that he wants the personnel files because they "may contain Rule 16
	evidence related to whether the officers who conducted the search of 905 Missouri Street
	failed to conduct the search properly or had motive to taint the search." Reply at 7. How
	is this not <i>Brady/Giglio</i> evidence? What would this evidence look like?
	4. Would Defendant be satisfied in his request for the personnel files if the Court
	inspected the files in camera to determine whether they contain any potentially material
	information?
	IT IS SO ORDERED.
	71 1/1/1
	Dated: 05/01/15 THELTON E. HENDERSON
	United States District Judge
1	